DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 271 HE 032 489

AUTHOR Wolcott, Linda L.
TITLE Assessing Faculty Beliefs about Rewards and Incentives in Distance Education: Pilot Study Results.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures; *Beliefs; *College Faculty; *Distance Education; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Incentives; Motivation; *Rewards; *Teacher Attitudes; Tenure; Values

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between distance education and institutional reward structures. The study sought to develop a scale to assess beliefs of college faculty about rewards and incentives in distance education, based on the hypothesis that faculty perceptions cluster around three factors: locus of motivation, institutional values and commitment, and return on investment. The measure, which was pilot tested with 33 faculty members, consists of 38 items and uses Likert response ranking. Results corroborate previous findings that faculty are highly motivated to participate in distance education by intrinsic rewards, although respondents also felt that faculty participated in distance education to earn more money. Results suggest that the department chairperson plays a pivotal role in faculty rewards for distance education, but that distance education provides a questionable return on investment, especially with respect to tenure and promotion. Seven data tables summarize results of the scale items. (Contains 14 references.) (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 435 271

# Assessing Faculty Beliefs About Rewards and Incentives in Distance Education: Pilot Study Results

Linda L. Wolcott, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Instructional Technology
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322-2830

(435) 797-2687
wolcott@cc.usu.edu

Presented at the annual meeting
of the American Educational Research Association

Montréal, Canada
April 19-23, 1999

HE 032 489

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

L. Wolcott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Assessing Faculty Beliefs About Rewards and Incentives in Distance Education: Results of a Pilot Study**

Linda L. Wolcott
Department of Instructional Technology
Utah State University

## Introduction

In today's colleges and universities, distributive technologies are changing not only the ways in which courses are delivered, but also the nature of faculty work. At many institutions, the pressure is on to establish distance education programs which offer students the convenience of learning anytime anyplace. Along with their traditional responsibilities, faculty face the added and sometimes urgent expectation to develop web-based courses with little institutional recognition of the time and effort such development and subsequent teaching involves. These demands come at a time when the academic community has been debating the nature of scholarship (Boyer, 1990) and changing faculty work (Mingle, 1993; *Work of Faculty*, 1994). Whereas participation in distance education is seen as not only representing more work but also different work, it is not surprising that institutions have encountered resistance to distance education among faculty.

Part of the resistance comes from faculty members asking themselves, "Is getting involved in distance education worth it?" "What's in it for me?" Dillon and Walsh (1992) identified rewards and incentives as key issues relating to faculty participation in distance education. More recently, a study by the National Center for Education Statistics (Lewis, Alexander, Farris & Greene, 1997) cited the lack of faculty rewards and incentives as a barrier to institutional growth in distance education to some extent at over 50% of the participating institutions. Indeed, in a survey of faculty and deans, Betts (1998) found that 3/4 of the distance teaching faculty and 96% of the non-participators saw few career advantages in participating in distance education.

Participation in innovations such as distance education is linked to the motivation of the participants (Rogers, 1983); motivation, in turn, is associated with rewards. Exchange theories (e.g., Vroom, 1964) express the relationship in terms of inputs and outputs, a quid pro quo. A worker expects something of value, either of an intrinsic or extrinsic nature, in exchange for his/her effort. The exchange framework further explains that both the value that the worker places on the outcome and the degree to which s/he perceives the outcome to be equitable in relation to his/her effort or that of others are related to motivation.

The locus of motivation is another important factor. In outlining principles from motivation theory that apply to academic staff, Lonsdale (1993) noted that despite the fact that intrinsic satisfactions are more effective than extrinsic factors in influencing performance, there has been a tendency on the part of institutions to focus on extrinsic incentives and rewards. However, Taylor and White (1991), Wolcott (1997), and Betts (1998) found that distance education faculty were motivated more by intrinsic than extrinsic reasons. Wolcott and Betts (1998) enumerated incentives associated with personal and socially derived satisfactions, and identified two types of disincentives they labeled inhibitors and de-motivators. Further, Betts (1998) noted discrepancies in perceptions between administrators and faculty with respect to factors they perceived would be motivating to faculty.

What an institution values is reflected in its reward system. Recent debate has focused attention on institutional reward structures that traditionally have had inflexible promotion criteria across disciplines and have been unresponsive to differing expressions of scholarship (Diamond, 1993; Edgerton, 1993). Institutional reward systems have also been criticized for being out of touch with faculty priorities, incongruent with espoused institutional goals, and for overemphasizing research while under-valuing teaching (Mingle, 1993). As technology continues to accelerate the rate of change in higher education and impact the work of faculty, institutions are challenged to keep pace in matching values with relevant faculty rewards. Distance education and other forms of distributed learning are a case in point. In examining reward practices, for example, Wolcott (1997) found that tenure and promotion practices were not very accommodating of activities associated with distance education. That study underscored the importance of institutional values and commitment to distance education, and illustrated the link between them and faculty rewards.

The purpose of the present study is to further our understanding of the relationship of distance education and institutional reward structures. Based on the groundwork laid by Wolcott (1997), Betts (1998), and Wolcott and Betts (1998), the study seeks to develop a scale to assess faculty beliefs about rewards and incentives in distance education.

**Method**

Development of the scale began with the creation of categories from themes identified from previous research. The study hypothesizes that faculty perceptions about rewards and incentives cluster around three factors: locus of motivation, institutional values and commitment, and return on investment. Items were developed for each category; a total of 42 items comprised the first draft. To confirm whether categorization of items aligned with the hypothesized constructs and to examine the adequacy of the operational definitions of the scale characteristics,

judgmental validity evidence was gathered. Data were collected from 20 graduate students in the Department of Instructional Technology at Utah State University. The students were given the conceptual definitions for each of the hypothesized constructs and asked to assign each item to one of the three categories based on the given definitions. Using the statistical package SPSS, frequency analyses were run on student responses to determine the degree of agreement among item assignments. Any item that was placed in the appropriate category by 70% or more of the sample was retained intact. For items where there was disagreement, the wording was revised to more appropriately align with the construct category. One item was shifted to a more appropriate category; four items were determined to have poor congruence with any of the categories and were dropped from the scale. The revised scale consisted of 38 items. Once confidence in the conceptual definitions was obtained and the operational ability of the items determined, the scale was prepared using a Likert response ranking, ranging from A, representing strongly disagree to E, indicating strongly agree.

A sample of 46 faculty members from within the same institution was identified to pilot test the instrument. The sample consisted of tenure-track, research, and clinical faculty who had taught during the fall semester or who were currently teaching during the spring semester on one of two statewide distance education networks (one, a one-way video/two-way audio satellite system; the other, a closed-circuit interactive television system with two-way video and two-way audio). Temporary and adjunct faculty members were not included in the sample. The scale, along with a cover letter, an incentive coupon for an ice cream cone at the student union, and a self-addressed envelope for return through the campus mail, were sent to the sample. After a week, an email reminder was sent to faculty from whom a completed questionnaire had not yet been returned.

Responses to the pilot scale were entered into a spreadsheet file using Microsoft Excel98 and subsequently imported into the statistical package, SPSS. In SPSS, data were analyzed to obtain frequency distributions on each item; cross tabulations were conducted to identify response trends among the four categories of subjects: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and lecturer/instructor. Correlation coefficients were calculated between pre-selected items associated with institutional values, rewards, and perceived return on investment. Prior to performing the calculations, data were screened for outliers as well as missing and miscoded data. The following section reports the results of the pilot application of the draft scale.

**Preliminary Results**

Thirty-three out of 46 faculty members responded for a return rate of 72%. The sample included more full professors (13) than associate (9) or assistant professors (6). These, along

with 5 individuals who classified themselves as lecturers or instructors, comprised the sample. The majority of subjects (75%) were male. Few subjects reported whether they were tenured, untenured, or not in a tenure track position; of the 13 who did respond, all indicated they were tenured. The college with the largest number of subjects was the College of Education with 15, representing 46.9% of the sample. The colleges of Business; Humanities, Art and Social Sciences; and Science reported 5, 4, and 4 subjects, respectively. The large representation from Education reflects the active distance education degree programs in instructional technology, psychology, and special education. Demographic results are summarized in Table 1.

Of the ten items that dealt with faculty beliefs about motivation, that is, what motivates faculty to participate in distance education, there was no single item on which a high percentage of subjects strongly agreed. As reported in Table 2, the majority of subjects either agreed or strongly agreed with the beliefs that: (a) faculty want to earn more money (63%); (b) teaching distance education courses is personally rewarding (57%), and (c) faculty want to extend the reach or influence of their programs. Likewise, there was no single item on which a high percentage strongly disagreed. However, more subjects disagreed than agreed with the statements that the opportunity to use new technologies (54%) and the opportunity to develop one's teaching skills (54%) motivate faculty.

Concerning items relating to institutional values and commitment, 45.5% of the subjects strongly agreed that distance education was congruent with their institution's mission. Three other items for which the subjects reported moderate agreement were their beliefs that: (a) their involvement in distance education is valued by their department chair/head (63%), (b) their department chair/head is supportive of their involvement in distance education (57%), and (c) distance education is a high priority at the institution (51%). As indicated in Table 3, subjects took a neutral stand on the remaining twelve items.

Table 4 summarizes responses relating to faculty beliefs about the return on their investment in teaching distance education courses. Faculty tended to be neutral on many of these items, their responses clustering toward the center or to the left (disagree) of the response scale. The one notable exception was item 5 in which 45.5% of the subjects agreed that the rewards they received for teaching distance education courses were equitable to those their colleagues received for the same activity. Fifteen subjects (45.5%) strongly disagreed that their efforts in distance education had earned them formal recognition within their department, college, or institution. The majority of subjects either disagreed or strongly disagreed with statements that: (a) their participation in distance education earns them credit toward improving their record of research and scholarship (69.7%), (b) compensation for teaching a distance education course is equitable

(66.6%), (c) faculty receive equitable credit for producing distance education materials (54.6%), (d) the rewards they receive in return for distance teaching are equitable with respect to the amount of time and effort they invest (54.6%), (e) distance education has a positive effect on their earning a merit increase in salary (54.5%), and (f) that their efforts in distance education earn them informal recognition (54%) and have a positive effect on their earning tenure or advancement in rank (51.5%).

The size of the pilot sample did not justify testing for statistical significance among groups. In looking at the distribution of scores across the different ranks of faculty, however, we note several trends among the associate and assistant professors that would be worth watching in connection with their beliefs about rewards and their return on investment. Unlike other respondents, assistant professors strongly disagreed (33.3%) that the rewards they receive for distance education are equitable with those their colleagues receive for distance teaching. Assistant professors disagreed or strongly disagreed more frequently than did their colleagues that the rewards for distance teaching were equitable to those received for classroom teaching (66.7%), and equitable with respect to the amount of time and effort invested (83.4%).

In a similar vein, the associate professors, more than assistant or full professors, disagreed or strongly disagreed (75%) that their efforts in distance education have a positive effect on their earning tenure and/or advancement in rank. They strongly disagreed that their involvement in distance education earns them formal recognition (66.7%) and has a positive effect on their earning a merit increase (55.6%). With respect to these two beliefs, they, together with the assistant professors, had a higher percentage of negative responses than did the full professors. Associate and assistant professors were also aligned in disagreeing that their participation in distance education earns them credit toward improving their record of service and earns them informal recognition.

One of the major assumptions underlying the development of the scale is that values held by the institution influence the nature and perception of institutional rewards. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated between items related to institutional values and commitments and those items concerned with extrinsic rewards. Table 5 summarizes the results of data analysis in which faculty beliefs about the extent to which their involvement in distance education is valued by their department chair/head are correlated with a number of institutional rewards. Many items were found to be highly correlated. For example, the belief as to whether their involvement is valued by the department chair/head has a direct relationship with the belief about whether their participation in distance education earns them credit in annual performance reviews with the department chair/head ($r=.633$, $p<.01$). In turn, this belief is highly correlated

with the faculty's perception about whether their efforts earn them informal recognition (r=.674, p<.01) and merit increase (r=.734, p<.01), and have a positive effect on their earning tenure and/or advancement in rank (r=.712, p<.01). Faculty perceptions regarding whether their participation in distance education is valued by those who serve on their tenure/advancement committee is also highly correlated with their beliefs as to whether their efforts have a positive effect on their earning tenure and/or advancement in rank (r=.690, p<.01), and earn them credit in annual performance reviews with the committee (r=.847; p<.01). Further, the latter belief is strongly related to faculty perceptions about whether their efforts have a positive effect on their earning tenure and/or advancement in rank (r=.756, p<.01) whether they earn credit for improving their records of teaching (r=.692, p<.01) and service (r=.675, p<.01). Finally, there is a strong relationship between faculty perceptions concerning whether their participation in distance education earns them credit in annual reviews both with their committees and their department heads (r=.712, p<.01). These and other beliefs associated with the tenure/promotion committee are displayed in Table 6.

Table 7 highlights several significant correlations with faculty beliefs about the extent to which deans, the central administration, and colleagues value their involvement in distance education. Faculty beliefs as to whether their dean and the central administration value their involvement are both correlated rank (r=.635, p<.01 and r=.567, p<.01), respectively, with their belief as to whether their efforts in distance education have a positive effect on their earning tenure and/or advancement in rank. This belief is also reflected in the moderate relationship found between it and the beliefs about the extent to which distance education is a high priority at the institution (r=.539, p<.01) as well as within the academic unit (r=.517, p<.01).

In addition, with respect to the belief about whether the central administration values their participation, there was a direct relationship with the faculty's belief as to the extent to which the rewards they receive in return for their participation are equitable with respect to the amount of time and effort their invest (r=.609, p<.01). Faculty perceptions concerning whether distance education is personally rewarding is moderately correlated with their belief about the degree to which it is professionally rewarding (r=.772, p<.01). Each is also equally correlated (r=.503, p<.01) with the perception as to whether the returned rewards are equitable to the time and effort invested.

Data analysis did not yield any significant negative correlations. Three slightly negative findings emerged, however, all dealing with the belief as to whether distance education was congruent with the mission of the institution. There is a weak inverse relationship between faculty's beliefs about the congruence of distance education with the institution's mission, and

their beliefs as to the equity of credit they receive for materials produced for distance education courses (r=-.042), about the credit they receive toward improving their record of research and scholarship (r=-.104), and their involvement as valued by their colleagues in their academic unit (r=-.076).

**Discussion**

Results from the pilot administration of the faculty beliefs assessment scale corroborates previous findings that faculty are highly motivated to participate in distance education by intrinsic rewards (Taylor & White, 1991; Betts, 1998; Wolcott & Betts, 1998). That subjects also indicated a high degree of agreement with the belief that faculty participate in distance education because they want to earn more money seems to contradict previous conclusions that faculty are less motivated by extrinsic rewards. The wording of the items relating to reasons for participation may have confused the issue. Worded in the third person, the items were likely to have elicited responses that represent the motives subjects attribute to other faculty rather than their own motives for participation. For this reason, correlation coefficients were not calculated on items that addressed intrinsic and extrinsic factors for participation in distance education.

Responses to the draft scale strengthen the conclusion in Wolcott's (1997) study that the department chairperson/head plays a pivotal role in faculty rewards for distance education. At the same time, however, current findings also confirm many of the concerns that Wolcott raised about distance education and its questionable return on investment especially with respect to tenure and promotion. Negative perceptions of the quid pro quo for teaching distance education courses call into question the equity of rewards, and heighten concerns that faculty are not receiving recognition, merit increases, or credit based on this growing dimension of their work. According to preliminary information from faculty beliefs, teaching distance education courses still poses a risk to junior and untenured faculty members that their efforts will go under-valued and un-rewarded.

The significant relationships identified among items confirm previous qualitative findings about the connection between values and rewards (Wolcott, 1997; Wolcott & Betts, 1998), and add another dimension to our understanding. They give use confidence in the constructs and assumptions underlying the development of the scale. The high number of correlated items play up the importance of those in positions to provide credit and reward to faculty for a range of teaching, service, and research activities. Further, they speak to the importance of the articulation and communication of institutional values. The current line of research into faculty beliefs about the rewards and incentives in distance education will continue with the revision of the scale, its administration with a larger national sample, and the validation of obtained scores.

**References**


Betts, K. S. 1998. Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study. Ed.D. diss., The George Washington University. Abstract in *Dissertation Abstracts International* 59/07: 2376A.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professoriate.* Princeton, N. J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R. M. 1993. How to change the faculty reward system. *Trusteeship* 1(5):17-21.

Dillon, C. L. and S. M. Walsh. 1992. Faculty: The neglected resource in distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education* 6(3):5-21.

Edgerton, R. 1993. Re-examination of faculty priorities. *Change* 25(4):10-25.

Lewis, L., Alexander, D., Farris, E., and B. Greene. 1997. *Distance Education in Higher Education Institutions.* U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES 98-062).

Lonsdale, A. 1993. Changes in incentives, rewards and sanctions. *Higher Education Management* 5, 223-35.

Mingle, J. R. 1993. Faculty work and the cost/quality/access collision. *Trusteeship* 1(5):11-16.

Rogers, E. M. 1983. *Diffusion of Innovations.* New York: The Free Press.

Taylor, J. C., and V. J. White. 1991. Faculty attitudes towards teaching in the distance education mode: An exploratory investigation. *Research in Distance Education* 3(3):7-11.

Vroom, V. H. 1964. *Work and motivation.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wolcott, L. L. 1997. Tenure, promotion, and distance education: Examining the culture of faculty rewards. *The American Journal of Distance Education* 11(2):3-18.

Wolcott, L. L., and K. S. Betts. 1998. What's in it for me? Incentives for faculty participation in distance education. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Work of faculty: Expectation, priorities, and rewards. *Academe* (Jan.- Feb. 1994): 35-48.

Table 1. Profile of Sample

| | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Gender | | |
| Males | 25 | 75.8 |
| Females | 8 | 24.2 |
| Totals | N=33 | 100 |
| | | |
| Rank | | |
| Full professor | 13 | 39.4 |
| Associate professor | 9 | 27.3 |
| Assistant professor | 6 | 18.2 |
| Lecturer, instructor, or clinical faculty | 5 | 15.1 |
| Totals | N=33 | 100 |
| | | |
| College | | |
| Agriculture | 0 | 0 |
| Business | 5 | 15.6 |
| Education | 15 | 46.9 |
| Engineering | 1 | 3.1 |
| Family Life | 1 | 3.1 |
| Humanities, Arts, & Social Sciences | 4 | 12.5 |
| Natural Resources | 2 | 6.3 |
| Science | 4 | 12.5 |
| Totals | N=32 | 100 |

Table 2. Responses to Items Related to Motivation

| | Strongly Disagree | | | | Strongly Agree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total |
| 3. Faculty . . . find distance education personally satisfying or fulfilling. | 3<br>9.1% | 12<br>36.4% | 8<br>24.2% | 10<br>30.3% | 0<br>0% | n=33<br>100% |
| 6. The opportunity to teach new students . . . motivates faculty. | 2<br>6.1% | 8<br>24.2% | 6<br>18.2% | 11<br>33.3% | 6<br>18.2% | n=33<br>100% |
| 10. Teaching distance education courses is personally rewarding. | 0<br>0% | 6<br>18.2% | 8<br>24.2% | 14<br>42.4% | 5<br>15.2% | n=33<br>100% |
| 15. Faculty want to earn more money. | 2<br>6.1% | 6<br>18.2% | 4<br>12.1% | 13<br>39.4% | 8<br>24.2% | n=33<br>100% |
| 17. The opportunity to use new technologies motivates faculty. | 3<br>9.1% | 15<br>45.5% | 9<br>27.3% | 6<br>18.2% | 0<br>0% | n=33<br>100% |
| 23. The opportunity to develop one's teaching skills motivates faculty. | 2<br>6.1% | 16<br>48.5% | 9<br>27.3% | 3<br>9.1% | 1<br>3% | n=31<br>93.9% |
| 27. Faculty want to extend the reach/influence of their program. | 0<br>0% | 4<br>12.1% | 10<br>30.3% | 15<br>45.5% | 4<br>12.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 33. Faculty want to further themselves professionally. | 3<br>9.1% | 12<br>36.4% | 7<br>21.2% | 7<br>21.2% | 3<br>9.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 37. The opportunity to try something new is motivating. | 2<br>6.1% | 13<br>39.4% | 6<br>18.2% | 10<br>30.3% | 1<br>3.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 38. Teaching distance education courses is professionally rewarding. | 3<br>9.1% | 4<br>12.1% | 9<br>27.3% | 13<br>39.4% | 3<br>9.1% | n=32<br>97% |

Table 3. Responses to Items Related to Institutional Values and Commitment

| | Strongly Disagree 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Strongly Agree 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. My involvement in distance education is valued by my department chair/head. | 2<br>6.1% | 5<br>15.2% | 5<br>15.2% | 15<br>45.5% | 6<br>18.2% | n=33<br>100% |
| 8. Distance education is congruent with the mission of my institution. | 1<br>3% | 2<br>6.1% | 4<br>12.1% | 11<br>33.3% | 15<br>45.5% | n=33<br>100% |
| 11. My involvement in distance education is valued by the central administration. | 4<br>12.1% | 7<br>21.2% | 16<br>48.5% | 4<br>12.1% | 2<br>6.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 14. Administrators at my institution are committed to distance education. | 3<br>9.1% | 4<br>12.1% | 12<br>36.4% | 12<br>36.4% | 2<br>6.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 16. Distance education is a high priority at my institution. | | 5<br>15.2% | 9<br>27.3% | 14<br>42.4% | 3<br>9.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 19. My academic unit . . . is committed to distance education. | 2<br>6.1% | 5<br>15.2% | 10<br>30.3% | 12<br>36.4% | 4<br>12.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 21. My dept. chair/head is supportive of my involvement in distance education. | 0<br>0% | 4<br>12.1% | 10<br>30.3% | 11<br>33.3% | 8<br>24.2% | n=33<br>100% |
| 22. My involvement in distance education is valued by my colleagues within my academic unit. | 5<br>15.2% | 9<br>27.3% | 12<br>36.4% | 7<br>21.2% | 0<br>0% | n=33<br>100% |
| 25. Distance education is a high priority in my academic unit. | 1<br>3% | 12<br>36.4% | 11<br>33.3% | 6<br>18.2% | 3<br>9.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 28. My involvement in distance education is valued by my dean (or equivalent administrator). | 1<br>3% | 10<br>30.3% | 13<br>39.4% | 5<br>15.2% | 3<br>9.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 34. My dept. chair/head sees to it that faculty receive appropriate credit for teaching distance education courses. | 3<br>9.1% | 7<br>21.2% | 9<br>27.3% | 11<br>33.3% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 35. My involvement in distance education is valued by those on my tenure/advancement committee. | 3<br>9.1% | 9<br>27.3% | 11<br>33.3% | 7<br>21.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |

Table 4. Responses to Items Related to Return on Investment

| | Strongly Disagree 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Strongly Agree 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. The amount of work I put into teaching a distance education course is equal to what I get out of it. | 5<br>15.2% | 10<br>30.3% | 5<br>15.2% | 11<br>33.3% | 1<br>3% | n=32<br>97% |
| 4. My efforts in distance education earn me informal recognition. | 6<br>18.2% | 12<br>36.4% | 5<br>15.2% | 9<br>27.3% | 1<br>3% | n=33<br>100% |
| 5. The rewards I get in return for . . . distance education are equitable to those my colleagues receive. | 2<br>6.1% | 6<br>18.2% | 5<br>15.2% | 15<br>45.5% | 3<br>9.1% | n=31<br>93.9% |
| 7. My efforts in d. e. have a positive effect on my earning tenure or advancement. | 10<br>30.3% | 7<br>21.2% | 7<br>21.2% | 5<br>15.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=31<br>93.9% |
| 9. My participation in d. e. earns me credit toward improving my record of service. | 5<br>15.2% | 7<br>21.2% | 11<br>33.3% | 8<br>24.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=33<br>100% |
| 12. Compensation for teaching a distance education course is equitable. | 8<br>24.2% | 14<br>42.4% | 2<br>6.1% | 6<br>18.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 13. My participation in d. e. earns me credit in annual performance reviews with my dept. chair/head. | 6<br>18.2% | 5<br>15.2% | 11<br>33.3% | 10<br>30.3% | 1<br>3% | n=33<br>100% |
| 18. The rewards I get in return for . . . distance education are equitable to those I receive for classroom teaching. | 7<br>21.2% | 9<br>27.3% | 10<br>30.3% | 5<br>15.2% | 1<br>3% | n=32<br>97% |
| 20. My participation in d. e. earns me credit toward improving my record of teaching. | 7<br>21.2% | 6<br>18.2% | 12<br>36.4% | 5<br>15.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 24. My efforts in d. e. have a positive effect on my earning a merit increase. | 10<br>30.3% | 8<br>24.2% | 10<br>30.3% | 4<br>12.1% | 1<br>3% | n=33<br>100% |
| 26. My efforts in distance education earn me formal recognition. | 15<br>45.5% | 8<br>24.2% | 5<br>15.2% | 4<br>12.1% | 1<br>3% | n=33<br>100% |
| 29. The rewards I get in return for . . . distance ed. are equitable to those my colleagues in other programs receive for distance teaching. | 2<br>6.1% | 2<br>6.1% | 15<br>45.5% | 8<br>24.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=29<br>87.9% |
| 30. My participation in d. e. earns me credit toward improving my record of research and scholarship. | 11<br>33.3% | 12<br>36.4% | 6<br>18.2% | 2<br>6.1% | 1<br>3% | n=32<br>97% |
| 31. My participation in d. e. earns me credit in annual performance reviews with my tenure/promotion committee. | 6<br>18.2% | 7<br>21.2% | 11<br>33.3% | 6<br>18.2% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |
| 32. Faculty receive equitable credit for materials produced for d. e. courses. | 5<br>15.2% | 13<br>39.4% | 7<br>21.2% | 6<br>18.2% | 0<br>0% | n=31<br>93.9% |
| 36. The rewards I get in return for . . . distance education are equitable with respect to the amount of time and effort I invest. | 5<br>15.2% | 13<br>39.4% | 8<br>24.2% | 4<br>12.1% | 2<br>6.1% | n=32<br>97% |

Table 5. Correlation Matrix for Items Related to Institutional Values (Department Chair/head)

| Item | Valued by dept. head | Credited in annual dept. review | Earn informal recognition | Positive effect on tenure or advance-ment | Congruent with mission | Earn merit increase | Earn formal recognition | N | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valued by dept. head | 1.00 | | | | | | | 33 | 3.55 | 1.15 |
| Credited in annual dept. review | .633** | 1.00 | | | | | | 33 | 2.85 | 1.15 |
| Earn informal recognition | .467** | .674** | 1.00 | | | | | 33 | 2.61 | 1.17 |
| Positive effect on tenure or advancement | .557** | .712** | .793** | 1.00 | | | | 31 | 2.42 | 1.29 |
| Congruent with mission | .228 | .016 | .243 | .411* | 1.00 | | | 33 | 4.12 | 1.05 |
| Earn merit increase | .455** | .734** | .524** | .731** | .226 | 1.00 | | 33 | 2.33 | 1.14 |
| Earn formal recognition | .125 | .485** | .617** | .603** | .122 | .595** | 1.00 | 33 | 2.03 | 1.19 |

*p<.05
** p<.01

Table 6. Correlation Matrix for Items Related to Institutional Values (Tenure/Advancement Committee)

| Item | Valued by committee | Credit in annual committee review | Credit for materials | Credit toward research/ scholarship | Credit toward teaching | Credit toward service | Positive effect on tenure or advance-ment | Congruent with mission | N | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valued by committee | 1.00 | | | | | | | | 32 | 2.88 | 1.07 |
| Credit in annual committee review | .847** | 1.00 | | | | | | | 32 | 2.72 | 1.17 |
| Credit for materials | .510** | .566** | 1.00 | | | | | | 31 | 2.45 | .99 |
| Credit toward research/scholar-ship | .584** | .595** | .534** | 1.00 | | | | | 32 | 2.06 | 1.05 |
| Credit toward teaching | .687** | .692** | .350 | .446* | 1.00 | | | | 32 | 2.66 | 1.18 |
| Credit toward service | .526** | .675** | .290 | .299 | .345 | 1.00 | | | 33 | 2.85 | 1.15 |
| Positive effect on tenure or advancement | .690** | .756** | .459* | .288 | .515** | .596** | 1.00 | | 31 | 2.42 | 1.29 |
| Congruent with mission | .083 | .157 | -.042 | -.104 | .137 | .351* | .411* | 1.00 | 33 | 4.12 | 1.05 |

* p<.05
** p<.01

Table 7. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients for Items Related to Institutional Values (Dean, Central Administration, and Colleagues)

| Item | Valued by dean | Valued by central adminis-tration | Valued by colleagues | N | Mean | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Positive effect on tenure or advancement | .635** | .567** | | 31 | 2.42 | 1.29 |
| Formal recognition | | .443** | .248 | 33 | 2.03 | 1.19 |
| Informal recognition | | | .222 | 33 | 2.61 | 1.17 |
| Congruent with mission | .329 | .314 | -.076 | | | |
| High priority at institution | | .344 | | | | |
| High priority in academic unit | | | .314 | | | |

** $p<.01$